



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/809,448 | 03/15/2001 | Kjell Andersson | 01-212 | 5219 |

7590

12/05/2002

BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.
Suite 1201
900 Chapel Street
New Haven, CT 06510-2802

EXAMINER

JUSKA, CHERYL ANN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,448

Applicant(s)

ANDERSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl Juska

Art Unit

1771

-- **Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspondence address --**
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1, 2, and 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,332,733 issued to Hamberger et al.

Hamberger discloses a tongue and groove joint for two flat sectional floor pieces (abstract). Figure 1 shows a left (i.e., first) piece having a groove 28 and a projection thereunder 36 which matches the tongue 20 and recess 22 of the right (i.e., second) piece. The projection 36 includes an edge 34 which slopes upwards thus creating a greater thickness than the thickness adjacent the groove. Edge 34 is matched by edge 24 of the right piece. Additionally, tongue 20 has a bevel edge (shown between reference numbers 20 and 24). Furthermore, the vertical height of projection 36 is approximately the same height as the lower surface of the groove. Thus, it can be seen that claims 1, 2, 5, 7, and 8 are anticipated by the cited Hamberger reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Hamberger reference in view of WO 96/23942 issued to Andersson.

Hamberger fails to teach the use of an anti-slip treatment or coating. However, said anti-slip treatments or coatings are well-known in the art. For example, Andersson discloses a tongue and groove joint which has flocked layers on matching surfaces (abstract and Figure 5). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to employ the flocked anti-slip layer of Andersson in the Hamberger invention in order to increase the friction of the matching surfaces, thereby enhancing the locking capability of the joint. Therefore, claims 3 and 4 are rejected as being obvious over the cited art.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited Hamberger reference.

Hamberger does teach the feature of claim 6, wherein the upper defining surface of the recess is substantially planar, but does not teach the upper surface of the projection is also planar. Despite Hamberger's teaching that said surface is angled, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the angle to be substantially planar, thereby matching the recess surface, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of the joint profile. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in

the art. *In re Dailey*, 149 USPQ 47. therefore, claim 6 is rejected as being obvious over the prior art.


Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Cheryl Juska whose telephone number is 703-305-4472. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



CHERYL A. JUSKA
PRIMARY EXAMINER